REMARKS

Claims 1-29 remain pending in this application. Of these claims, claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement for the reason set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Claims 1, 7, 15 and 22 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,268 in view of Ichihara. Figure 1 has been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because it fails to show the term –8. The specification has been rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, because the specification includes terms which are not clear, concise and exact as discussed on pages 5 and 6 of the Examiner's Office Action.

In view of the preceding amendments, the enclosed Terminal Disclaimer and the following remarks, these rejections and objections are traversed, and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the specification and claims, and has realized that there are a number of inadvertent errors that appear to be the result of word processing or printer software errors. Particularly, a number of the greek symbols used in some of the equations and text did not get printed correctly. The distortion factor D_k in the independent claims 1, 7, 15 and 22 should have been $\{(atanh(Cx_k))/Cx_k\}e^{-j\Phi_k}$ as shown in paragraph [0022], I ine 2. Further, $M_k = (Bx_k \tanh (Cx_k))/6$ in independent claims 1, 7, 15 and 22 should have been $\Phi_k = (\pi x_k \tanh (Cx_k))/6$ that is the output of the multiplier 96 identified in line 6 of paragraph [0021]. Also, the term – 8 in paragraphs [0019] and [0025] should have been - λ as shown as one of the inputs to the multiplier 80 in figure 1.

Docket No. NGC-00105 (20-0156)

Serial No. 09/835,594

The amendments to the specification and claims above should address all of these inadvertent errors so that the specification, claims and drawings are consistent with each other. No new matter is being entered by these amendments. It is therefore respectfully requested that the §112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1-27 and the specification be withdrawn and the objection to figure 1 be withdrawn.

Applicants are submitting herewith a Terminal Disclaimer that disclaims any portion of a patent issuing on this application beyond the term of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,268. It is therefore resepectfully requested that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

It is now believed that this application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that personal contact with Applicant's representative would expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to call the undersigned at his convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

WARN, HOFFMANN, MILLER & LALONE, P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Date:

12/23/04

P.O. Box 70098

Rochester Hills, MI 48307

Telephone: (248) 364-4300

John Å. Miller

Registration No. 34,985